

**REMARKS**

Applicants add new claims 15-18. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable by Ueda et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0042086). Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a second processing system for storing said image data read by said reading means into said first storage means in parallel with processing by said first processing system.” The Examiner alleges that Ueda discloses these features of claim 1 in paragraph [0013]. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

Ueda is directed to a print order receiving device for editing an image object displayed on a display screen and obtaining an edited image object for printing (page 1, paragraph [0001]). Ueda discloses that the print order receiving device includes a display screen, image data input section for inputting original image data of a customer, a memory, object operating means capable of processing the original image data and editing the original image object displayed on the display screen for a print order and print order information producing means for producing print order information on the basis of the result of the operation on said objects (page 2, paragraph [0012]). However, Ueda does not disclose that a second processing system for storing

said image data read by said reading means into said first storage means in parallel with processing by said first processing system.

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to clearly point out where each and every feature recited in claim 1 is disclosed in Ueda. The MPEP in section 706.02 states that “it is important for an examiner to properly communicate the basis for a rejection so that the issues can be identified early and the applicant can be given fair opportunity to reply.” In this outstanding Office Action, the Examiner merely cites two different paragraphs [0012] and [0013] that are directed to different embodiments disclosing almost the same features except paragraph [0012] discloses a print order receiving device and paragraph [0013] discloses a print receiving producing system that includes the print order device. However, the Examiner fails to clearly communicate which features the Examiner relies on to correspond to each and every element recited in claim 1 as required by the MPEP.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Ueda does not disclose a first processing system and a second processing system as recited in claim 1. The Examiner asserts that paragraph [0012] allegedly discloses the first processing unit and paragraph [0013] allegedly discloses the second processing system. However, in paragraph [0013], Ueda discloses a print receiving producing system that includes the print order receiving device that is described in paragraph [0012]. Therefore, since the print order receiving device disclosed in both paragraph [0012] and [0013] is the same device, it is improper for the Examiner to allege that the print order receiving device in paragraph [0012] corresponds to a first processing system and the same print order receiving device disclosed in paragraph [0013] corresponds to a second processing system.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that even though Ueda discloses that the print order receiving device comprises a display screen and a memory as pointed out by the Examiner, Ueda does not disclose anything about a second processing system for storing said image data read by said reading means into said first storage means in parallel with processing by said first processing system.

In particular, Ueda discloses that when a customer inserts a removable medium C into the print order receiving device, the reading device 12 reads out the image data memorized in the removable medium C and stores it in the removable medium M, and then displays all the images corresponding to the image data memorized in the removable medium C subsequently (page 8, paragraph [0134]). Therefore, since Ueda discloses that the CPU 16 reads out the image data and stores it in memory M and then displays the images on the screen, Ueda does not disclose that a second processing system storing the image data read by the reading means into a storage means in parallel with a first processing means displaying said image from said image data read by said reading means on said display. That is, Ueda does not disclose a first CPU storing image data read by the reading means into the removable medium M while a second CPU displaying the image data read by the reading means on the screen. Since the reading is done and completed prior to display, the operations are sequential rather than performed in parallel.

In addition, Applicants submit that paragraph [0012] of Ueda merely discloses image data input section, a display screen a memory and the like. However, Ueda has no disclosure of “print order input means” as recited in claim 1. For example, Ueda discloses an image data input

section for inputting original image data of a customer; it does not disclose a means for inputting a printing order of said image recording on the recording medium.

Moreover, Ueda discloses a printing order information producing means for producing printing order information on the basis of the result of operation of said image objects. In contrast, claim 1 describes a first processing system for displaying an image form said image data read by said reading means on said display and receiving an order instruction from said input using said display image to generate order information.

Furthermore, the Examiner cites paragraph [0004] for disclosing “wherein said order information generated by said first processing system and said image data stored into said first storage means by said second processing system are related to each other and output.” However, paragraph [0004] merely discloses that “image data memorized in the memory medium are read by a personal computer or the like and the image is displayed on a display, or the image is printed through a printer connected to the personal computer.” This does not disclose order information generated by said first processing system and said image data stored into said first storage means by said second processing system are related to each other and output.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2, 7, 8 and 13

Applicants submit that claims 2, 7, 8 and 13 depend from claim 1, and therefore claims 2, 7, 8 and 13 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional elements recited in these claims.

*Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Anderson (5,903,306). Claims 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Nozaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,204). Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 3, 4, 5 and 6

Applicants submit that since claims 3, 4, 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and since Anderson does not cure the deficiency noted above with regard to claim 1, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional elements recited in these claims.

Claims 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14

Applicants submit that since claims 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14 depend from claim 1 and since Nozaki does not cure the deficiency noted above with regard to claim 1, these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional elements recited in these claims.

*New claims*

Applicants adding new claims 15-18 to further define the claimed invention and provide more varied scope of protection. These claims depend from claim 1, and therefore are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency. No new matter is added.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ebeneser D. Thomas  
Ebeneser D. Thomas  
Registration No. 62,499

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 22, 2008